

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SANDRA L. CULLUM and DEIRDRE  
SALEH,

Plaintiffs,

-v-

WYNDHAM HOTELS & RESORTS CORP.,  
WYNDHAM DESTINATIONS INC., MR.  
GEOFFREY A. BALLOTTI, WYNDHAM  
HOTELS (WH) & RESORTS, INC., MS.  
ELISABETH GALE, DBA WYNDHAM  
CORPORATE OFFICE &  
HEADQUARTERS, BROADRIDGE  
CORPORATE ISSUER SOLUTIONS,

Defendants.

1:22-CV-09700-LTS-SN

ORDER

Plaintiffs filed this action pro se. By order dated February 12, 2024, the Court dismissed this action with prejudice against all but one Defendant (1) pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act (“FAA”), 9 U.S.C. section 1 et seq., (2) for lack of personal jurisdiction, and (3) for failure to state a claim. (Docket entry no. 49 (the “Order”).) On March 4, 2024, Plaintiffs filed a “motion request for formal reconsideration” of the Order. (Docket entry no. 50 (the “First Motion for Reconsideration”).) After the Court denied the First Motion for Reconsideration (docekt entry no. 52), Plaintiffs filed a submission, styled as a Notice of Appeal, “to respectfully request the reconsideration of the recent dismissal of [their] case” (docket entry no. 54 (the “Second Motion for Reconsideration”) at 2).

To the extent that the Court liberally construes the Notice of Appeal as another motion for reconsideration under Local Civil Rule 6.3 (see Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons, 470 F.3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006)), the Court denies the Second Motion for Reconsideration

because a “litigant is entitled to a single motion for reconsideration.” Guang Ju Lin v. United States, No. 13-CV-7498-SHS, 2015 WL 747115, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 18, 2015). Successive motions for reconsideration are not permitted because a “Court must narrowly construe and strictly apply Local Rule 6.3, so as to avoid duplicative rulings on previously considered issues[.]” Montanile v. Nat’l Broad. Co., 216 F. Supp. 2d 341, 342 (S.D.N.Y. 2002). Plaintiffs already made the arguments raised in the Second Motion in their First Motion for reconsideration, which was denied on the grounds that they had shown no controlling decisions or facts overlooked in the Order dismissing the action.

The Second Motion for Reconsideration is denied. This order resolves docket entry no. 54. The Clerk of Court is also respectfully directed to mail Plaintiffs, at the addresses below, copies of this Order.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York  
March 7, 2025

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain  
LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN  
United States District Judge

Mail to:

Sandra L. Cullum  
2770 West 5th Ave., Apt. 7A  
Brooklyn, NY 11224

Deirdre Saleh  
2675 W. 36th St., Apt. 1E  
Brooklyn, NY 11224